

4.11 Cultural Resources

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

4.11 Cultural Resources

4.11.1 Introduction

This analysis addresses the likelihood of potentially impacting cultural resources as a result of implementing management regimes associated with the proposed NFHCP, other action alternatives, and No Action Alternative. The analysis focuses on potential impacts on cultural resources in the Project and Planning Areas.

4.11.2 Issues Eliminated from Further Analysis

All cultural resources issues identified during public scoping were analyzed. None were eliminated from analysis.

4.11.3 Issues Addressed in the Impact Analysis

Cultural resources issues identified during public scoping and listed in the Scoping Report (FWS and NMFS 1998) are addressed in the impact analysis. The primary theme in the issues is that the NFHCP should not interfere with the protection and maintenance of Native American Treaty Rights, tribal resources, traditional fishing rights, and religious practices. The cultural resources analysis focuses on the likelihood of an impact occurring, rather than on what specific impacts may occur.

4.11.4 Description of Area of Influence

The area of influence covers western Montana, northern Idaho, and Washington. It includes the Project Area (Plum Creek lands) and Planning Area (Plum Creek and adjacent lands) (see Map 1.3-1 in Chapter 1). Immediate areas of influence within the Project Area include types of locations where prescriptions associated with the proposed NFHCP and alternatives would be implemented. Lands within the Planning Area, but outside the Project Area, that are of special interest include Native American reservation lands, ceded lands, traditional tribal areas of interest, and Traditional Cultural Properties.

What is the Likelihood of Impacting Cultural Resources?

The alternatives and the proposed NFHCP all help protect cultural resources through compliance with existing regulations. River and stream riparian corridors were among the most popular areas used by prehistoric and historic cultures, and are most likely to have cultural resource values. To the extent that these resources are located in areas that receive incremental protection under the alternatives, there would be different levels of effect. For example, the action alternatives and the proposed NFHCP offer better protection of cultural resources than the No Action Alternative because of slightly less activity and disturbance in riparian areas. The likelihood of encountering or impacting cultural resources would be lowest with the Simplified Prescriptions Alternative because of the wider riparian buffers and least amount of activity. The likelihood of encountering cultural resource sites would be the same regardless of whether a 10-, 20-, or 30-year Permit is selected.

4.11.5 Affected Environment

This section provides a broad overview of prehistoric and historic cultural resources of the Project Area and ethnographic information on Native American tribes in the Planning Area. The following discussion is based in part on cultural resources presentations contained in the ICBEMP documents (ICBEMP 1997a; Quigley and Arbelbide 1997), whose Project Area includes most of the Project and Planning Areas for this EIS/NFHCP. The ICBEMP documents note that to Native Americans, sacred cultural resources consist of their entire heritage of beliefs, traditions, customs, and spiritual relationships to the earth and natural resources. This section also includes a summary of cultural resource sites known to occur in the Project Area based on consultation with the State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs) in Montana, Idaho, and Washington.

The first human inhabitants of the area appeared more than 12,000 years ago. They were nomadic, following big game herds, and maintaining settlements in riverine, lake, and wetland environments (ICBEMP 1997a). Prehistoric resources associated with these early inhabitants include campsites, villages, graves, quarries, pictographs, trails, rock shelters, and religious sites (Raedeke Associates, Inc., 1995). Upland and mountain environments apparently received greater use over the past 4,000 years because of more moderate climatic conditions (Quigley and Arbelbide 1997). Culturally significant resources to these early inhabitants included hundreds of plant and animal species, minerals, landscapes, and natural processes that were used for subsistence and social values, in religious and traditional ceremonies, and in

commerce. Access to major rivers that provided trout, salmon, steelhead, sturgeon, lampreys, and suckers was critical to many of these cultures. Subsequently, tribes kept large herds of horses that had been introduced by Euroamericans in the 1700s and early 1800s (ICBEMP 1997a).

The Lewis and Clark Expedition in 1804 and 1805 marked the earliest Euroamerican contact with native cultures in the area. This was soon followed by further Euroamerican exploration, fur trade, military posts, missionary work, and settlement (ICBEMP 1997a). The U.S. government encouraged settlement of the West by granting citizens, railroad companies, and mining and timber interests free land in exchange for meeting development requirements. Commercial development of the area was closely tied to the evolution of transportation from walking, to horses, to locomotives. Many of the pioneers remained in the area with the discovery of gold in the 1860s rather than migrate farther west (Quigley and Arbelbide 1997).

The effects of Euroamericans on Native Americans included disease, population shifts, cultural changes, new trade systems and goods, new religious practices, and competition for resources, lands, and traditional places (Quigley and Arbelbide 1997). This conflict and competition resulted in a treaty-making period between Indian tribes and the U.S. government that ended in 1871. The treaties provided tribes exclusive title to reservation lands and established federal government trust responsibilities to the tribes for traditional land uses such as hunting, fishing, gathering, and livestock grazing. Tribal ways of life and uses of the land began to change during the late 1800s and early 1900s with the creation of new federal

agencies and land management policies (ICBEMP 1997a).

A number of American Indian Tribes have reservations, ceded lands, ancestral ties, or areas of interest within the Planning Area. Areas of interest do not necessarily include reservation or ceded lands, but they do reflect a tribe's native territory, subsistence range, traditional and historical use area, usual and accustomed areas, or zone of influence (Quigley and Arbelbide 1997). The main tribes in the Planning Area include the Salish-Kootenai and Blackfoot Tribes in Montana; the Nez Perce, Lochsa, St. Joe, and Coeur d'Alene Tribes in Idaho; the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Indian Nation in central Washington; and the Cowlitz and Chinook Tribes in western Washington. Other tribes whose areas of interest occur within the Planning Area boundaries include the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (southern Washington), the Kalispel Tribe of Indians (northwestern Montana), and the Kootenai Tribe of Idaho (northwestern Montana) (ICBEMP 1997a).

Numbers and kinds of cultural resource sites known to occur on Project Area lands in Montana, Idaho, and Washington were identified by contacting the Montana SHPO in Helena, the Idaho SHPO in Boise, and the Washington State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation in Lacey, Washington. Information from Idaho and Washington identifies cultural resource sites specifically occurring on Plum Creek lands. Information from Montana identifies cultural resource sites known to occur on sections of land where Plum Creek has ownership. However, because many of these sections have multiple landowners, the cultural resource site may not occur specifically on Plum Creek land.

In Montana, Plum Creek owns land in 3,146 sections within the Project Area. A total of 953 known cultural resource sites occur on these 3,146 sections. However, because of multiple landowners in many sections, it is estimated that approximately one-half, or 475, of the 953 known cultural resource sites actually occur on Plum Creek land. Approximately 100 of the 475 cultural resource sites are represented primarily by lithic scatters, as well as firehearths, roasting pits, rock cairns, and surface stone quarries, and occasionally by a rock shelter/cave, pictograph, and scarred trees. The time period for many of these sites has been designated by researchers as "prehistoric." The remaining known cultural resource sites on Plum Creek land are predominantly historic in origin. About 150 of these sites are variously categorized as historic structures, and include pioneer log buildings, early residences, farmsteads, apartment buildings, schools, churches, and other architectural structures. The remaining 225 known historic properties on Plum Creek land in Montana include facilities or artifacts associated with historical travel, railroad, and stage routes; roads and trails; mining activity; industrial development, such as timber harvesting and sawmills; fire lookouts; and stock raising.

In Idaho, Plum Creek owns land in 265 sections within the Project Area. A total of 81 known cultural resource sites, consisting of 64 historic sites, 15 prehistoric sites, and 2 historic sites that may also be prehistoric sites, occur on Plum Creek land within these sections. Nearly 80 percent of the Idaho sites are historic, comprised primarily of historic cabins, out-of-use fire lookouts, mining sites (such as buildings and tailings), and logging sites (such as log flumes and decks). Two of the historic sites are camps made by the Lewis and

Clark expedition (10IH569 and 10IH574). Ten of the 15 prehistoric sites are pieces of the Lolo Trail, which was recorded multiple times because it crossed multiple sections of lands. Two of the prehistoric sites are “log peelings” of live ponderosa pine made by Native Americans (10IH1324 and 10IH2633).

In Washington, Plum Creek owns land in 141 sections within the Project Area. A total of five known cultural resource sites, consisting of four historic sites and one historic site that may also be a prehistoric site, occur on Plum Creek land within these sections. The four historic Washington sites include the Boundary Mine (45YA279), Rimrock Dam Power Station #3 (45YA445), Trail #123 (45SA510), and forest boundary trees (45SA457). The fifth site that may also be prehistoric is a rock shelter and lava tube.

4.11.6 Environmental Consequences

Potential impacts on cultural resources would include disturbance, destruction, or loss of part or all of the resource, and modification of the environmental setting around the site. Potential ethnographic impacts would include those activities resulting in the disturbance or loss of tribal heritages, which consist of beliefs, traditions, customs, and spiritual relationships. The following discussion focuses on the likelihood of such impacts occurring under the proposed NFHCP and alternatives. The impact analysis focuses on the 30-year Permit period, but concludes with brief assessments of the optional Permit periods of 10 and 20 years. Because cultural resources already receive some level of protection under existing regulations and because of similar assessment outcomes, discussions

of the proposed NFHCP and other action alternatives refer to discussions under Existing Regulations—No Action Alternative.

Existing Regulations—No Action Alternative

Activities associated with the No Action Alternative would be subject to the same federal, state, and local regulations currently used to document and protect, and to preserve and conserve, cultural and ethnographic resources on private lands. The SHPO in each state is most often the point of contact for private landowners whose activities result in the inadvertent discovery of cultural resource sites. Coordination with SHPOs by private property owners is voluntary. The No Action Alternative would likely have some level of impact on known and unknown cultural resources, depending on site-specific factors. For example, areas where modification or avoidance of operations by Plum Creek are necessary to avoid take of listed salmonids for ESA compliance, may receive more protection for cultural resources than areas receiving state forest practice rule protections. There would be some likelihood of finding and potentially disturbing cultural resources, particularly along perennial stream and river channels since these areas often have a high probability of past human use. However, the specific impact on cultural resources is unknown at this time since future Plum Creek forest management activities in relation to the location of cultural resources is unknown. Impacts on cultural resources in Washington would be reduced since under Washington forest practice rules the state must conduct a cultural resources review prior to approval of timber harvest plans. Similar specific protections do not apply under Idaho or

Montana state law. Activities that would occur under the No Action Alternative would not interfere with the protection and maintenance of Native American Treaty Rights, tribal resources, traditional fishing rights, and religious practices in the Project Area or Planning Area under other laws. Numerous treaties, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978, and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 provide for and protect the rights of American Indians, including their traditional and cultural uses of land.

Plum Creek's Proposed NFHCP

Impacts on known and unknown cultural resources may occur in some cases under the proposed NFHCP. The specific impact on individual cultural resources is unknown at this time since Plum Creek forest management activities and the associated conservation measures under the NFHCP in relation to the location of cultural resources are unknown. In general, impacts on cultural resources under the proposed NFHCP could be greater or less than those under the No Action Alternative depending on the site-specific activities under each alternative and the location of the particular cultural or ethnographic resource. Impacts would likely be less under the NFHCP than the No Action Alternative in areas where listed salmonids do not occur and the NFHCP would provide additional protections. For example, currently listed salmonids do not occur over approximately 80 percent of the Project Area; in these areas, the NFHCP would likely provide more protection for cultural resources than the No Action Alternative because of NFHCP conservation measures for Permit species. In areas where modification or avoidance of operations by Plum Creek are necessary to avoid take of

listed salmonids under the No Action Alternative for ESA compliance, impacts on cultural resources may be greater under the NFHCP than under the No Action Alternative. The likelihood of harm to Native American cultural resources would likely be less under the proposed NFHCP than under the No Action Alternative because of the generally greater protections adjacent to stream and river channels where most past human activity was concentrated, particularly in Tier 1 watersheds and in riparian-upland Interface Caution Areas.

Similar to the No Action Alternative, impacts on cultural resources in Washington would be reduced since under Washington forest practice rules the state must conduct a cultural resources review prior to approval of timber harvest plans.

Optional 10- and 20-Year Permit

Lengths. Those areas that would receive greater protection under the proposed NFHCP would likely receive more protection under the 30-year Permit than under Permits with terms of 10 or 20 years. Areas that would receive less protection under the NFHCP would likely receive less protection under a 30-year Permit than a 10- or 20-year Permit.

Internal Bull Trout Conservation Plan Alternative

Similar to the proposed NFHCP, the effects on cultural resources may be more or less than those under the No Action Alternative. The likelihood of affecting known and unknown cultural resources may be slightly less in some cases than under the No Action Alternative because of internal Plum Creek conservation measures, including their Environmental Principles, that would result in reduced

activity and ground disturbance in riparian corridors adjacent to stream and river channels. However, like under the proposed NFHCP, the potential for impacting these resources could exist.

Optional 10- and 20-Year Permit

Lengths. Effects of Permit lengths on cultural resources are expected to be the same as under the proposed NFHCP.

Simplified Prescriptions Alternative

Similar to the proposed NFHCP, effects on cultural resources may be more or less than those under the No Action Alternative. The potential to adversely impact known and unknown cultural and ethnographic resources in the Project and Planning Areas under this alternative would be slightly less, in some cases, than under the No Action Alternative. The likelihood of impacts on cultural resources could decline because of wider riparian buffers under this alternative than other alternatives, and the reduced activity and ground disturbance adjacent to perennial channels. However, similar to the proposed NFHCP, the potential for impacting cultural resources would still exist.

Optional 10- and 20-Year Permit

Lengths. Effects of Permit lengths on cultural resources are expected to be the same as under the proposed NFHCP.